	·
1	STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF DUTCHESS - COUNTY COURT
2	X
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK :
4	- against - : Indictment #
5	102/1983
6	DEWEY R. BOZELLA :
7	X
8	Further Proceedings
9	rurdier Froceedings
10	October 28, 2009 2:15 P.M.
11	Dutchess County Courthouse
12	10 Market Street Poughkeepsie, New York 12601
13	
14	BEFORE:
15	HONORABLE JAMES T. ROONEY
16	Presiding County Court Judge
17	APPEARANCES:
18	WILLIAM V. GRADY, ESQ. DISTRICT ATTORNEY - DUTCHESS COUNTY
19	For the People BY: EDWARD F. WHITESELL, ESQ.
20	Assistant District Attorney
21	ROSS E. FIRSENBAUM, ESQ.
22	Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale, and Dorr, LLP
23	399 Park Avenue New York, New York 10022
24	
25	Laurie Hardisty, RMR Senior Court Reporter

1	THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is Case Number 1
2	on the calendar, under Indictment Number 102 of 1983,
3	People of the State of New York versus Dewey Bozella.
4	Counsel, your appearances, please?
5	THE COURT: Actually, before we do the
6	appearances yes, let's do the appearances first.
7	Go ahead.
8	MR. WHITESELL: Okay.
9	For the People, Your Honor, Edward Whitesell.
10	I'm Chief of the Special Investigations Bureau of the
11	Dutchess County District Attorney's office,
12	representing the People of the State of New York.
13	THE COURT: Is the Defendant present?
14	MR. WHITESELL: No, he's not.
15	COURT OFFICER: He's en route, Judge.
16	THE COURT: All right. Let's have the
17	Defendant present.
18	(Pause)
19	(Whereupon the Defendant entered courtroom.)
20	THE COURT: Good Afternoon.
21	The Defendant is present.
22	Now that the Defendant is present, would the
23	attorneys give their appearance, please?
24	MR. WHITESELL: Thank you, Your Honor.
25	My name is Ed Whitesell. I am Chief of the

1	Special Investigations Bureau of the Dutchess County
2	District Attorney's office. I am here today
3	representing the People on this matter, Your Honor.
4	MR. FIRSENBAUM: Good Afternoon, Your Honor.
5	My name is Ross Firsenbaum. I'm a Senior
6	Associate at the Law Firm of Wilmer, Cutler,
7	Pickering, Hale, and Dorr. I'm joined by my
8	colleagues Shauna Friedman, Peter Macdonald, John
9	Hintz, and Alysha Austern. We represent the
10	Defendant, Dewey Bozella.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12	There were applications for media coverage,
13	and I want to address that first.
14	Now, I did preliminarily conference this with
15	the attorneys.
16	And your position on that is?
17	MR. WHITESELL: We have no objection to the
18	media coverage request, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right.
20	And, Counsel?
21	MR. FIRSENBAUM: We have no objection, Your
22	Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right.
24	We did receive requests for use of still
25	photography by the New York Times, which I will grant,

1	and also CBS TV, for videotape for later broadcast,
2	and also for the Poughkeepsie Journal for videotape
3	for later broadcast and also for still photography,
4	and also Reuters for still photography.
5	Are there any other members of the media who
6	I did not address?
7	(No response.)
8	THE COURT: So, what I am permitting under
9	the circumstances is the audiovisual and the still
10	photography coverage; okay?
11	So, with that, and having addressed the issue
12	of the videocameras, I will and still
13	photography I will address now the issues before
14	the court in this case.
15	This is the first appearance in court since
16	this Court's ruling on October 14, 2009, granting the
17	Defendant's application to vacate his conviction and
18	ordering a new trial.
19	So, let me first let me first turn to the
20	District Attorney, Mr. Whitesell, for your position.
21	MR. WHITESELL: Thank you, Your Honor.
22	May I use the podium, Your Honor?
23	THE COURT: You certainly may.
24	MR. WHITESELL: I'd like to begin, if I can,
25	Your Honor, by acknowledging receipt of the Court's

decision with regard to the 440 motion. Even though we received it, obviously, in the mail and everyone knows what the decision was, I would like at this point, at least, to formally acknowledge the receipt.

The first matter, from the standpoint of the People, is whether or not there is any sound legal basis for the People to appeal the Court's decision with regard to this.

I advised the Court that I have completely reviewed the decision and have found no legal basis to take any further action with regard to the Court's Decision on the 440 motion.

Before I talk about where the People are going to go from this point, I'd like to -- to thank Mr. Firsenbaum and the people from WilmerHale for the courteous way in which they treated me during the course of this process. I understand it's a very difficult one and has been for Mr. Bozella, as well as a difficult one for them in many ways, and I appreciate the way they've treated me during the course of the process.

The ultimate question to be addressed at this point is whether or not the People will go forward with the third trial of this Defendant some 32 years after the commission of the crime.

1 In April of this year, subsequent to the 2 service upon our office and the filing of the 440 3 motion, I was assigned by District Attorney Bill Grady 4 to not only respond to the motion, but to undertake a 5 complete review of the investigation and prosecution 6 of this case, which commenced with Emma Crapser's 7 death in 1977. This process included a complete 8 review of the District Attorney's file with regard to 9 the prosecution of this Defendant, including trial 10 transcripts, police reports, District Attorney notes, 11 motion answers, decisions, appeals, and a prior 440 12 motion in this case. 13 As well, I reviewed the entire District Attorney's office file with regard to the King 14 sisters' homicide in 1978 and the subsequent 15

prosecution of Donald and Anthony Wise for that offense.

As best as possible, given the amount of time which has elapsed, we attempted to reach out for any and all witnesses in this case, whether or not they were police officers, private citizens, potential witnesses for the People or, for that matter, potential witnesses for the Defendant.

I also had an opportunity to interview both the original Prosecutor and one of the Defense

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Attorneys from the original case, as well as any Police Officers available who would have been working on the case 32 years ago.

In some cases these attempts were met with various degrees of obstruction, ranging from an unwillingness to cooperate, to, in some cases, refusal to be interviewed.

During this process, as a result of the allegations made in counsel's papers in support of his motion, I attempted to interview both Donald and Anthony Wise concerning any knowledge they may have had about this Defendant's guilt or any involvement they may have had in the Crapser homicide.

Donald Wise did not make himself amenable to interview by our office or the City of Poughkeepsie Police Department.

In the Spring of this year, I was able to interview Anthony Wise extensively at the Mid-Orange Correctional Facility.

Also during this process I attempted to determine the status of any and all physical evidence recovered as a result of the City of Poughkeepsie Police Department's investigation into the Crapser homicide. As well, I was able to extensively interview the key witness in both trials, Wayne

Mosley, both with regard to his recollection of the events and his willingness to cooperate in any further prosecution.

As a result of this review, I can advise the Court of the following: The physical evidence in this case, which was recovered by the City of Poughkeepsie Police Department as a result of their investigation of the Crapser homicide, including, but not limited to, items of evidence removed from the scene of the crime and at autopsy, was discarded on May 15, 2003, as part of the regular course of business of the City of Poughkeepsie Police

Department. This action was taken with the consent of the District Attorney after a determination was made that all appeals in this case had been exhausted and the prior 440 motion had been resolved.

It should be noted that the last appeal in this case was resolved in October of -- of 2 -- excuse me -- 1998 when the Supreme Court of the United States denied cert. in this matter. This is the regular course of business in not only the City Police Department, but other agencies in the County, upon consultation with the District Attorney's appellate staff. Therefore, there is no physical evidence available to the People to be used in any subsequent

Subject to Federal Rule of Evidence 502

third trial in this case, whether or not that physical evidence would be considered inculpatory or exculpatory with regard to the issue of this Defendant's guilt.

Our review of the matter has determined that many of the witnesses who were integral to the prosecution of this case, both at the 1982 trial and the 1990 trial, are no longer available, either because they are deceased or because their whereabouts cannot be adequately identified at this time. These would be witnesses who would be necessary to the People's case, as well as witnesses who might arguably be brought forth by the Defense in support of the Defendant's contention that he did not commit this crime.

The Court will recall from the motion that there were two key witnesses in this matter; Wayne Mosley and Lamar Smith. Attempts by the District Attorney's office to contact Lamar Smith -- and I believe this might be confirmed by the Defendant's attorneys' own attempts to do so -- have been fruitless. Our contacts with Mr. Smith's family indicate that they do not currently have contact with him because of a long-standing problem within the family.

Normal investigative procedures over the course of the past couple of weeks used by the City of Poughkeepsie Police Department in an attempt to locate Mr. Smith have also proven fruitless.

It's the People's position at this time that we cannot say that Mr. Smith would be amenable to process should the People make a decision to go forward with this trial. His appearance and testimony would be crucial because it would be necessary to — to corroborate the accomplice, Mosley.

The second key witness in the case, as the Court knows, was Wayne Mosley. As I stated previously, I've had an opportunity to extensively discuss this matter with Mr. Mosley. The 19 years that have passed since the Defendant's second conviction have resulted in issues arising with regard to his potential testimony which make his ability to take part in any subsequent trial, at the very least, problematic.

It is also important to note that Mosley must be considered an accomplice, as a matter of law, with regard to this case.

As such, any testimony he would give at trial would have to be corroborated by either physical evidence or some other witness. At this point, I

cannot advise the Court that such other evidence exists.

I must advise the Court that this decision in no way is based upon a finding in my review that this Defendant did not commit the crime. The fact remains that he was previously convicted by two juries, and those convictions were upheld by various appellate courts.

In the same sense, the decision is in no way based upon some belief that because he has already served 27 years as a result of his prior conviction, it would be somehow a waste of the taxpayers' money or the Court's time for this case to go forward to a third trial.

The decision is based solely upon the evidence that is available to the People and, parenthetically, to the Defendant at this time, which would be used at trial to convince a jury that he is, in fact, guilty beyond a reasonable doubt or, again, parenthetically, that could be used by this Defendant in an attempt to exonerate himself.

It's the People's position, Your Honor, we cannot go forward with a third trial of this Defendant at this time.

As a result, it's our position that the

1	matter must be dismissed in the interest of justice,
2	and the People so move to dismiss the Indictment.
3	THE COURT: All right.
4	So, you are moving to dismiss the Indictment?
5	MR. WHITESELL: That's correct, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Would Defense Counsel like to be
7	heard?
8	MR. FIRSENBAUM: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	The Defendant has no objection to the
10	People's motion.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
12	The application to dismiss the Indictment is
13	granted, and Mr. Bozella is ordered to be released
14	immediately.
15	Is there anything further from counsel in
16	this case?
17	MR. WHITESELL: I don't have anything, Your
18	Honor, no.
19	THE COURT: Anything further?
20	MR. FIRSENBAUM: Your Honor, we would just
21	ask that the Defendant be released from the shackles.
22	THE COURT: Yes, he shall be.
23	MR. FIRSENBAUM: Thank you.
24	(Off the record discussion between the Judge
25	and Court Officer.)
•	i

1	THE COURT: All right. The Defendant should
2	be immediately released at this time. Thank you.
3	If there's nothing further from the
4	attorneys, court will be in recess.
5	Thank you.
6	
7	(Whereupon the proceeding concluded.)
8	
9	* * *
10	THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE ABOVE TRANSCRIPT IS
11	A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF MY STENOGRAPHIC
12	NOTES TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF.
13	
14	Laure Hardista
15	Laurie Hardisty
16	Senior Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
i	